

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants propose to amend Fig. 2 of the drawings in accordance with the accompanying ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES.

Enclosed herewith is a REPLACEMENT SHEET in which the above changes have been incorporated.

#### REMARKS

Fig. 2 of the drawings has been amended to indicate the thickness at the bending portion as "g" and to include the relationship " $g > a$ ". As such, Applicant now believes that the drawings now clearly provide support for the claim language, i.e., in particular, claim 3.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1, 4-7 and 14 have been amended for clarity.

Applicant believes that the above changes answer the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, rejections of claims 1 and 7, and claim 14, and the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, rejection of claims 7 and 14, and respectfully requests withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,302,876 to Emmett in view of U.S. Patent 5,822,862 to Ferraro and U.S. Patent 972,436 to Clark. The Examiner has further rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmett in view of Ferraro and Clark, and further in view of Saturday Night Live "Mach 14" or U.S. Patent 1,920,711 to Pelizzola. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 9, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 3,489,589 to Nissen in view of Emmett and Ferraro and further in view of Clark. Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nissen in view of Emmett and Ferraro and Clart, and further in view of U.S. patent 3,224,900 to Creamer et al.

The Emmett patent discloses a razor blade with inclined edge, in which a razor blade cartridge includes two blades with edge portions bearing cutting edges that are in a spaced-apart, parallel relationship.

The Ferraro patent discloses a suspended blade shaving system, in which a plurality of straight blades are arranged within a cartridge.

The Clark patent discloses a process of making blades with soft centers, in which the razor blade is hardened and tempered in its entirety, then portions of the hardened/tempered razor blades are heat treated to render the razor blades softer and more flexible at the heat-treated portions.

The Examiner has conceded "Emmett does not disclose a top side of a blade attached to a bridge partition of the razor head, and an unattached bottom side,..." The Examiner then states "Ferraro discloses a top side of a blade (Fig. 3, 40,50,60) attached to a bridge partition (Fig. 3, 80,80a) of a razor head, and an unattached bottom side" and refers to Fig. 3 therein.

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mistaken. In particular, the relevant limitations in claim 1 (as well as claim 7) state "a further portion having a top side attached to the corresponding fixed bridge partition of the razor head, and a bottom side, said bottom side of said further portion being remote from said corresponding fixed bridge partition and spaced apart from any other structure in said razor head" and "a bending portion, positioned between the edge and further portions, where

the edge portion is bent relative to the further portion, said bending portion being spaced from said cutting edge and the fixed bridge partition". However, with regard to Ferraro, as shown in Fig. 3, a structural element (which may be equivalent to the corresponding fixed bridge partition of claim 1), is shown as being connected both to the top side of one blade member and the bottom side of an adjacent blade member. As such, Ferraro does not disclose or suggest the claim limitation "a further portion having a top side attached to the corresponding fixed bridge partition of the razor head, and a bottom side, said bottom side of said further portion being remote from said corresponding fixed bridge partition and spaced apart from any other structure in said razor head".

Applicant submits that this limitation is significant in that, as indicated in the specification on page 3, line 22 to page 4, line 13, by keeping unimpeded the gap c between the fixed bridge partition to which the top side of the further portion of one razor blade is attached, and a bottom side of the further portion of an adjacent razor blade, rinsing of debris from the area between the cutting edges and the blades is further enhanced.

Claim 6 includes the limitation "said razor head comprising four razor blades each mounted to a different corresponding fixed bridge partition, parallel to each other in the razor head, wherein a spacing is present between the cutting edges." While the SNL reference and the Pelizzola patent disclose razor heads having 5 or more blades, Applicant submits that neither SNL nor Pelizzola supply that which is missing from Emmett, Ferraro

and Clark, i.e., "a further portion having a top side attached to the corresponding fixed bridge partition of the razor head, and a bottom side, said bottom side of said further portion being remote from said corresponding fixed bridge partition and spaced apart from any other structure in said razor head" and "a bending portion, positioned between the edge and further portions, where the edge portion is bent relative to the further portion, said bending portion being spaced from said cutting edge and the fixed bridge partition".

Claim 7 relates to a method of manufacturing a razor blade for installation in a razor head, and contains limitations corresponding to those of claim 1.

Applicant submits that while Nissen generally discloses the manufacturing of a razor blade, Nissen does not supply that which is missing from Emmett, Ferraro and Clark, i.e., "attaching a top side of the further portion of the razor blade to a corresponding fixed bridge partition of the razor head, a bottom side of the further portion being remote from said corresponding fixed bridge partition and spaced apart from any other structure in said razor head, and spacing the bending portion from the corresponding fixed bridge partition."

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is not rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-9, 13 and 14, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by           /Edward W. Goodman/            
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611